

H.R. 5615: Continues until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap (P.L. 90-45 (7-3-67).)

H.R. 3349: Continues until the close of September 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of nickel. (P.L. 90-48 (7-7-67).)

H.R. 3652: Continues until the close of June 30, 1970, the existing suspension of duties on manganese ore (including ferruginous ore) and related products. (P.L. 90-49 (7-7-67).)

H.R. 1566: Provides for the free entry of a four-octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Vernon Schools, East Northfield, Massachusetts. (Private Law 90-65 (8-11-67).)

H.R. 1886: Provides for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one rheogoniometer for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. (Private Law 90-66 (8-11-67).)

H.R. 3029: Provides for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio. (Private Law 90-67 (8-11-67).)

H.R. 3737: Provides for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Riverside. (Private Law 90-68 (8-11-67).)

H.R. 4934: Provides for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University. (Private Law 90-69 (8-11-67).)

H.R. 4977: Provides for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University. (Private Law 90-70 (8-11-67).)

H.R. 2470: Provides for the free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of Tufts University, Boston, Massachusetts, one Perkin Elmer Automatic Digital Polarimeter with accessories for the use of Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts (text of S. 1380), and one gas-liquid chromatograph mass spectrometer for the use of the Massachusetts Division of the American Cancer Society (text of S. 1381). (Private Law 90-82 (8-28-67).)

H.R. 664: Amends the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and parts thereof shall be admitted free of duty. (Awaiting Presidential action.)

H.R. 1141: Permits duty-free treatment of limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; in lieu of above language of House-passed bill, which became amendment to H.R. 286 (P.L. 90-14), extends until December 31, 1969, time within which Vietnam servicemen may qualify for \$50 exemption from tariffs for gifts sent to the United States, permits under certain conditions importers to transport merchandise from the Port of Entry to a customs bonded warehouse without incurring liability for the duty involved until withdrawn from the warehouse, provides for rounding the amount of State and local taxes for purposes of computing the Federal excise tax on cigars, and allows a special deduction for additions to catastrophe reserves for mortgage guaranty insurance companies. (Awaiting Presidential action.)

H.R. 2155: Amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of Chinese gooseberries, and permits under certain conditions importers to transport merchandise from the port of entry to a customs bonded warehouse without incurring liability for the duty involved until withdrawn from the warehouse (latter is also provision of H.R. 1141, which is awaiting Presidential action). (Awaiting Senate floor action.)

VETERANS

S. 16: Extends full wartime benefits for Vietnam veterans and their dependents; increases educational allowances and broadens opportunities under the "Cold War G.I. bill"; and provides a cost-of-living increase with respect to non-service-connected pensions

similar to the increase Congress voted in the 89th Congress for those receiving compensation growing out of death or disability. (P.L. 90-77 (8-31-67).)

PUBLIC DEBT

H.R. 4573: Provides, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in Sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. (P.L. 90-3 (3-2-67).)

H.R. 10867: Increases the public debt limit set forth in Sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to \$358 billion effective on July 1, 1967, temporarily increases this debt limitation by \$7 billion, beginning with fiscal year 1969, up to June 30 of each fiscal year, and includes the face amount of any Federal National Mortgage Association participation certificates issued during fiscal year 1968 in determining the debt subject to limitation. (P.L. 90-39 (6-30-67).)

SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 12080: Provides 13 percent increases in social security benefits with a 25 percent increase in the minimum benefit; makes other improvements in the OASDI, Medicare, Medicaid and public welfare programs; initiates a new work-training program for recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children; finances increased supportive child welfare services; limits the extent of Federal participation in the Medicaid program; consolidates and increases authorizations for child health programs and grants and provides funds for the training of social work personnel. (Awaiting Presidential action.)

HEARINGS ONLY

Proposed cut-off of welfare funds to the State of Alabama. (Hearings held January 25 and February 23, 1967.)

Trade Policies and the Kennedy Round. (Hearing held March 10, 1967.)

S. 2100: Provides tax incentives to encourage private enterprise to provide adequate housing in urban poverty areas. (Hearings held September 14, 15, and 16, 1967.)

The nomination of Stanley D. Metzger to the U.S. Tariff Commission. (Hearing held on September 28, 1967.)

Proposals to impose import quotas on various commodities. (Hearings held on October 18, 19, 20, 1967.)

A FIGHT FOR A BETTER LIFE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the recent convention of the AFL-CIO, important and compelling national issues were discussed openly, honestly, and energetically. This is nothing new, however; the organized labor movement in the United States has made consistent contributions to a working dialog for democracy.

It is appropriate at this time to note the contribution of one very dedicated labor representative, Evelyn Dubrow. As legislative representative for the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, Evelyn Dubrow is characteristically a leader—a leader in progressive, constructive labor legislation. It is particularly refreshing to work with Evie, because she is proud of her accomplishments and her objectives. Pride rubs off on those who contact it, and I am proud to claim Evelyn Dubrow as an ally in the cause of a better way of life for the Nation's workers.

It is through the patient, precise reporting of Miss Dubrow that the 455,000 members of the ILGWU carry on effective communications with Congress and the general public. I am very much aware of the disfavor with which some people view the process of "special inter-

est lobbying," but I wish to make it clear that without the assistance and support of concerned groups and individuals, we would be less than effective as spokesmen for our public.

In an editorial in the December 1 edition of Justice, the ILGWU paper, recognition is given this function of the union movement. Evelyn Dubrow, the ILGWU, and the other Americans who make up the AFL-CIO, ought to be proud of the part they play in what the editorial calls a "fight for a better life." We want to join in that fight, but we are virtually powerless to act unless we continue to receive the encouragement and enthusiastic participation of the labor movement.

Because of the significance of the recent AFL-CIO convention, and because of the importance of the labor movement to all of us, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPULATION 200,000,000 PLUS

With no special effort at all, the nation last month passed the 200,000,000 population mark. Without either baby bonuses or organized family planning, we have moved inexorably toward the record count, many mistaking this statistic in biology for a measure of our ethical well-being and economic good health.

We should rather stop to consider that in most areas of the world, population growth rises in direct proportion to poverty. Other nations, nowhere near as well off as we are, far outstrip us in the rate of increase of their population, their poverty and the consequent problems. The conclusion is inescapable that denied all else, human beings cannot be denied offspring.

Indeed, there are some who argue that the only effective block to the increasing population explosion with which the world will have to deal will be the more effective spread of a higher standard of living. By increasing human desires for the good things of life, by expanding the horizons of ambition, by making available educational and business channels for achievement, family units are induced to limit their size in order to make better uses of their resources.

Greater availability of education, better health and housing and economic security have been the constant goals of the middle class. There is a strong tendency in our time to be disdainful of middle-class ideals. Vocal dissident groups denounce them as being tawdry and materialistic but offer disaffiliation from life's problems as an alternate.

There is also a tendency in some quarters to condemn the organized labor movement by charging it with having gone middle class. The mass of its members, through organized effort, have reached many of the elementary goals for which—in a more primitive time—they fought their historic strikes.

The fight for a better life begins with the drive for a higher standard of living. Another way of putting it is to say that the achievement of a better life for the mass of Americans will require the spread—not curtailment—of middle class ideals. The history of this nation is the story of a leveling up from the bottom and down from the top of our social structure toward an expansion of the vast middle.

As the AFL-CIO goes into national convention this week it faces an agenda of the unfinished tasks of our time. It ought to be clear to all that middle class or not, it is the organized labor movement of this nation—and not offside clamor groups—that

has been the most revolutionary force in our history by constantly striving for the improvement of the general welfare.

Delegates to that convention will be considering resolutions and programs calling for increased security for Americans through full employment, for more and better schools, for the building of model cities and the construction of decent homes, for fair housing and consumer protection and the further elimination of poverty—middle-class ideals all.

History provides few certainties, but one of them seems to be that while dictatorships from above or below are doomed to fail, taking a terrible toll, it is the middle mass of humanity that has endured in a steady striving for improvement for all.

ABM

THIN ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the recent decision by the administration to begin the construction of a thin antiballistic missile system has not met with the unanimous approval of our Nation's distinguished military scientists. In a *Look* magazine article of November 28, 1967, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, former assistant to the President for science and technology, and now provost of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, points to the risks involved in making the decision to spend up to \$6 billion on this initial nuclear defense system. Dr. Wiesner makes persuasive arguments against the usefulness of these missiles in an age of quick obsolescence. He points to the overwhelming advantage any offensive nuclear weapons system can have against a defense of this type.

Mr. President, our future military security involves questions which demand a most intensive analysis and not the superficial debate which preceded the announcement that construction of these missile sites would begin in the near future.

I ask unanimous consent to place the article, entitled "The Case Against the Antiballistic Missile System," in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST THE ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

(By Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner)

When China exploded a hydrogen bomb, waves of concern spread around the world. Renewed calls were raised in the United States for a defense that would protect us from Chinese nuclear ballistic missiles. These calls have now been heeded by President Johnson. Scientists agree that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union can protect itself completely from a nuclear attack by the other. But as long as Communist China's primitive missile force is very small, some protection can be achieved—and this is what the President has decided to buy. Because he couldn't persuade the Russians to consider limitations on missile defenses, the President has now ordered the building of a "thin" defensive system to protect us from the Chinese. The logic of the President's decision seems mighty tortured.

The word in Washington is that President Johnson was forced to bend under the pressure of the military, congressional and industrial sponsors of the antiballistic-missile system. Enormous pressure certainly existed, but such pressure on a President to build a missile-defense system is not new. Both Pres-

ident Eisenhower and President Kennedy were exposed to it. One of the most difficult decisions President Kennedy had to make concerned the Nike-Zeus missile-defense system. The pressures on him were tremendous, but after long, careful study, he decided, on technical grounds, not to build the Nike-Zeus. Today, we know that to have built that system would have wasted between \$20 and \$30 billion. It would have been already obsolete. I am certain that the system we are now planning will be regarded as ineffective before it is installed.

Secretary of Defense McNamara estimates that the United States could build an ABM system (for between \$3 and \$6 billion) that would provide a reasonably effective defense against Chinese ballistic missiles—for 10 to 15 years. But he concedes that such a system would do us little good against an attack by the Russians. Even if the thin ABM system is as effective as the Secretary of Defense says—and I strongly question this—should we take the portentous step of deploying an ABM system for protection against Red China? I think we should not.

In his long statement announcing the President's decision to build an anti-Chinese ABM system, Secretary McNamara concludes that the arguments marginally support its construction. This is obviously a matter of judgment. I think the arguments are overwhelmingly against building it. In fact, I believe that this decision could be as wrong and have as serious domestic and international consequences as the disastrous conclusion six years ago that a few military advisers and some weapons would lead to an early victory for South Vietnam's forces.

In the late 1950's, the United States first began to examine the problem of defense against ballistic missiles. At that time, the only useful concept involved low-altitude interceptors armed with nuclear weapons. The idea was that radars would track an incoming enemy missile and guide our "anti-missile missile" near enough so that the nuclear warhead, exploded at the right time, would destroy the enemy missile. One defensive rocket would be fired against each incoming object. But an enemy could easily confuse the radars—by including along with the real nuclear warheads high-altitude "decoys," such as lightweight metallic balloons. Since decoys break up or slow down when they hit the earth's atmosphere, we hoped that by waiting, we could pick out the real warheads and launch a defensive attack. The antimissile missiles would have to be placed near each city to be defended, and the tremendous heat and blast caused by the explosion of the defensive warheads, low over the cities, could inflict terrible civilian casualties. It was possible that such a defensive system would do as much damage as enemy warheads. The Nike-Zeus plans, therefore, included a major fallout-shelter program.

During the past two years, it has appeared feasible to build high-altitude defensive missiles for use against small-scale attacks. The nuclear warheads on the high-altitude missiles would be exploded far out in space—in an attempt to destroy both the decoys and the real enemy warheads. In this way, some defense of a much wider region, farther from each antimissile site, would be possible. The proposal is that, with enough sites, the entire United States can be protected. But this will not work if an attacker staggers his decoys and warheads in time and spreads them over a large area, or precedes them by a nuclear explosion of his own to "black out" our defending radars. High-altitude defense represents an improved approach to the problem of defense against ballistic missiles, but it is by no means a solution.

The basic technical fact about an ABM defense is that a sophisticated opponent can overcome any defense currently possible. Offense has all of the advantages; any defense system can be overpowered.

Today, the nuclear powers rely on the deterrent effect of their offensive missiles to keep the peace. A powerful incentive, therefore, exists for either side to increase its offensive-missile forces the moment the other starts to build an ABM system.

The Russians appear to be building a simple ABM defense around Moscow, and possibly other areas, though it is yet unclear that they have decided on a full-scale, antimissile defense system. In response, the United States has taken steps to add decoys and multiple warheads to its own offensive-missile force. These actions on our part are still quite limited, but the steps we have already taken, especially the introduction of multiple warheads on each missile to overwhelm possible Soviet defenses, will greatly increase the number of missile warheads in our inventory. The Russians appear to have been taking similar steps in anticipation of a U.S. decision to build an ABM system. An ABM system in the U.S. will stimulate the Soviets to increase the number of their offensive warheads.

The United States is earnestly seeking some agreement with the Soviet Union to limit the deployment of ABM systems and missiles, in order to forestall a new spiral in the arms race. Unofficial conversations have been held with individual Russians, but we have not succeeded in getting discussions started at an official government level. In Glassboro, President Johnson repeated to Mr. Kosygin our willingness to explore the problem. The Soviet Union does not seem ready to discuss such questions—yet. But there is no need for us to rush into an ABM deployment.

There is little relation between a Russian decision to deploy an ABM system (if, indeed, they have made a decision for more than an experimental system) and such a decision here. Our security would be seriously endangered if the Russians installed an effective ABM defense that could prevent our missile force from reaching their territory and if they simultaneously developed an effective defense against our Strategic Air Force bombers—something they have not been able to do so far. Since it is obvious folly for us to build a defense against missiles while we also are so vulnerable to a bomber attack, the Pentagon has quietly decided to spend four billion more dollars improving our air-defense system.

I do not believe that a really effective antimissile system is remotely possible for either the U.S. or the Russians. And even if the Russians could develop one, and a truly effective defense against our SAC bombers as well, our installing an ABM system would not restore our powers of deterrence. Only improvements in our own offensive-missile force, including "penetration aids" such as decoys and electronic jammers to ensure that our missiles could get through the Russian defense, could achieve this. This is our Defense Department's basic strategy.

The United States has embarked on a large, expensive program of outfitting ballistic missiles with multiple warheads and other devices to penetrate Russian defenses. We have also started a \$2 billion program to replace our submarine-based Polaris missiles with the larger Poseidon missiles, which can carry more and better penetration aids. As long as we continue to improve our missile forces and maintain our B-52 bomber force, our deterrent power will remain effective. An ABM system is not required to preserve the power and the effectiveness of our deterrents.

We should build an ABM system only if it gives us greater security. And in deciding this, we must assume that the Russians will respond to our ABM system by upgrading and enlarging their missile force—just as we are doing in response to their ABM activities. If the Russians were to do this, an American ABM system would leave us with less security and more vulnerable to destruction.

Secretary McNamara and many proponents of an ABM system concede that an anti-Soviet ABM defense would not be worth the huge expense, because the Russians could nullify its effectiveness at considerably lower cost to themselves. So the proponents now argue: We can at least provide ourselves with protection against Red China at a more modest cost and without starting a new Russian-American arms spiral. Is this so? Again, I think not.

An ABM system would grant us some protection against China's missiles during the early years of its missile buildup; but this protection would not be complete, and it would be short-lived, certainly, much shorter than 15 years. Once the Chinese can build intercontinental missiles, the cost to them of producing additional missiles would be relatively small (perhaps \$5 to \$10 million per missile). Within a short time, they would have enough missiles (say, 50 to 100) to penetrate our "anti-Chinese" ABM system.

The Chinese would certainly build penetration aids into their missile force. The techniques of designing such aids are neither highly complex nor exceedingly costly (one can learn all about them in American aerospace journals). I do not believe, therefore, that an ABM system will give us either complete or lasting protection against Chinese missiles. I am convinced we must rely instead on the offensive deterrent, as we must with the Russians; that is, we must rely on our known ability to retaliate devastatingly in case of a nuclear attack. Ten percent of our SAC bomber force could kill 200 million Chinese.

I am very skeptical that any ABM system based on the present approach will ever work at its calculated effectiveness. No one has even succeeded in developing an anti-aircraft defense that is as much as ten percent effective (three percent is a more common actual effectiveness). An ABM system that was only this effective would be almost worthless. Even if an ABM system were as much as 90 percent effective, it could still not prevent an opponent from inflicting millions of fatalities on us.

Besides, whenever an ABM system might be installed, how could a realistic test be made? We could not fire missiles at it (it would be located within the continental United States), and from hard experience during World War II, we know that far simpler devices (such as submarine torpedoes) fail to work the first time. I realize that a model system is being tested on Kwajalein, but these tests are under laboratory conditions and cannot simulate a nationwide installation manned by GI's and technicians. Even if we were willing to fire missiles at the system, the test would not be completely realistic, for we would be testing against our missiles, not enemy warheads. Few competent people expect the extremely complex ABM system to work the first time; yet it must to have any effect!

There will always remain a big chance that even if the system is working as designed, it will not intercept all of the enemy missiles. They will obviously know how our ABM system works; we will know little about their offensive weapons. Imagine the advantage a football team would have if it knew precisely its opponents' defense on every play. Remember that if a single enemy nuclear weapon leaks through the defense to a city, the city will be destroyed.

Besides, the Chinese could bypass our ABM system completely—either with low-altitude missiles launched from submarines or with aircraft, which, surprisingly enough, are more difficult to intercept than intercontinental ballistic missiles because they come in at relatively low altitude and do not follow predictable projectors the way a missile does. We simply cannot rely upon an ABM system to give us a sure defense against a Chinese attack.

Many people also fear that the deterrent power on which we rely against the Soviet Union will not be effective against China. The exceptional anxiety expressed each time the Chinese carry out a nuclear test seems related not to their military potential but to our view of them as irrational or unstable. This anxiety rises more from Chinese rhetoric than Chinese actions. Although the words of China's leaders have been inflammatory in the extreme, in action, they have been exceedingly cautious.

China's actual military capacity is, most likely for decades to come, hardly comparable to that of either the United States, or the Soviet Union. The Chinese have an extremely limited industrial capacity (until now, they have produced no aircraft of their own!). They also lack the broad base of technically trained manpower that is absolutely necessary for a modern military establishment. Nonetheless, they have made remarkable progress in developing nuclear weaponry. They took less time than any of the other nuclear powers to carry out a thermonuclear explosion. In this, they received considerable help from the Soviet Union, in the late 1950's, as well as a good deal of technological information from open sources and their own intelligence network. And they do appear to be making progress on missiles capable of carrying nuclear weapons. Apparently, they launched one of their nuclear weapons on a short-range missile. Though we have no evidence of a Chinese long-range ballistic missile, we know that their resources are adequate to develop one and I, believe, produce it in moderate numbers (100-200) in less than a decade.

During the late 1950's, many statements by Chinese leaders minimized the importance of nuclear weapons, arguing that they did not really change the relative power balance. We heard boasts that China alone among the great powers would be able to survive a nuclear war. All this has changed. The Chinese now renounce any intention of being the first to use their nuclear weapons, and they show every sign of a growing sophistication in nuclear matters, which is to be expected as they acquire knowledge of the terrible effects of nuclear explosions.

It is China's neighbors, not we, who would be most directly threatened by any Chinese missile force, and an ABM system in the U.S. would be of little help to them. We could not deploy an ABM system in India and Japan; they are too close to China to permit the system to work effectively. What, then, must the leaders and people of Japan and India think as we make plans to hide under an ABM umbrella while they have no way to defend themselves? If the United States is so fearful of China that it must create an ABM defense, should not Japan and India conclude that it is time for them to make their peace with the Chinese? There is no easier way for us to build up China in Asian eyes. No Asian can afford to believe that we are prepared to lose New York to counter a Chinese nuclear attack against them. Some Indian officials are already asking for a missile-defensive system.

Can we build a limited ABM system to protect us against China without stimulating the Soviet Union to respond with an offensive-force buildup of its own? I think not. Just as we are enlarging our missile forces because we cannot wait to see whether the Soviet Union is building a limited or an extensive ABM system, so the Russians could not wait to see whether our system would be a limited one before embarking on an offensive-missile buildup. Even if, as the President proposes, we build a thin ABM system, it would be unlikely to remain small; pressures from the military and industrial establishment to improve—and expand—it would be irresistible. Most military planners expect the system to expand rapidly, and in fact do not consider the initial system to be of much

use. This is the reality of the President's decision. I am convinced that once we decide to take the ABM route, we cannot avoid an enlarged arms race.

Three other consequences of the President's decision are not generally appreciated. First, an expanded ABM system will be needed eventually to cope with decoys and multiple warheads. It will almost certainly raise the issue of fallout shelters to protect the population both from Russian nuclear weapons and our own protective system.

Secondly, no one has bothered to mention the several hundred million dollars a year that it will cost to maintain and operate even this thin system or the billions of dollars it would take to run the final one.

Finally, our only substantial arms limitation accomplishment, the limited test ban treaty, is likely to be a victim of this step-up in the arms race. The developers of the ABM system will soon be telling us that they cannot assure its effectiveness without nuclear tests in the atmosphere. The pressure on the President to renounce the treaty in the interest of national security and protecting our multi-billion-dollar investment will be overwhelming.

The United States and Russia are learning to work together to create a more rational world order. Gone are those deep fears of a surprise attack that dominated the 1950's. The best hope for the future lies in joint efforts by the Soviet Union and the United States to eliminate the arms race. Such efforts will be impossible if each side is forced to offset the defensive and offensive buildup of the other.

Under the present circumstances, we are going to have to accept and live with a "deterrent balance." We have done it with the Russians. We will have to with the Chinese. There just is no way to avoid this; there is no magical or technical escape from the dilemmas of the nuclear age through defense. A sensible course would be to reduce greatly the offensive-missile forces on both sides, achieving the deterrence with much less danger to all of us.

Like most other scientists who have studied its problems, I am convinced that much mutually coordinated disarmament is technically achievable with considerably less risk, effort and cost than is involved in our current deterrent positions. The blocks to disarmament are political and psychological, not technical. Unfortunately, disarmament has no effective political support, no vested interests backing it, and no power base in the Government bureaucracy or in the Congress. Some of the same senators who have been pressing the President to spend tens of billions of dollars on defense against a missile attack have consistently tried to cut the tiny budget of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Substantial balanced disarmament is sensible, safe and technically achievable, and even partial disarmament would release many tens of billions of dollars for constructive uses. But it is not coming very fast. Until statesmen take disarmament efforts seriously and fashion international security arrangements more appropriate to the nuclear age we all live in, the best we can hope for is an increasingly nightmarish peace insured by only a balance of terror.

A real defense against nuclear-armed missiles is a mirage. Our only real security lies in peace itself. Nuclear weapons are just too potent for effective defense. The best defense is to prevent a nuclear war.

LABOR MOVEMENT SEEKS CHANCE FOR GREATER SERVICE TO POOR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, no one knows the problems, the frustrations and the desperate needs of America's poor like the poor themselves. It goes without

saying that only the deprived fully comprehend deprivation. Only those without sufficient food know the real meaning of hunger and malnutrition. Only families forced to live in reeking big city slums and dilapidated rural shacks understand the real meaning of squalor. Only those who cannot afford medical and hospital care know the true disaster of illness and disease. Only those doomed to unemployment or a lifetime of low-paying unskilled jobs understand the heartbreak of no education and the lack of job training.

The one group of Americans that comes closest to understanding the tragedy of penury, hunger, ignorance and disease are the Nation's working men and women and their trade union organizations. It can be truthfully said that the American labor movement, now nearly 200 years old, was the first to wage organized war against poverty in the New World and that the AFL-CIO today is one of the most effective instruments in the continuing struggle to eradicate poverty from this most affluent of all nations.

It deserves to be emphasized, Mr. President, that the excellent support which the AFL-CIO, representing 15,000,000 working men and women, gives to the war on poverty is not just verbal and moral. Day in and day out the AFL-CIO and its 130 affiliates participate in national and local antipoverty programs. Day in and day out thousands and thousands of AFL-CIO leaders and members devote their time, talent and energies, as volunteers, to a great variety of local, regional and national antipoverty programs. Because they work closely with these programs and are themselves part of the programs, they and their organizations are in a unique position to judge the worth of the overall effort.

Because that is true, Mr. President, the judgment of the AFL-CIO on the Federal antipoverty program is worth the careful consideration of Congress and the American people.

The seventh constitutional convention of the AFL-CIO has been meeting this week in Bal Harbour, Fla., and the more than 1,000 delegates unanimously approved a policy statement dealing with the war on poverty and the OEO. Among many things worth noting about this statement, Mr. President, is the fact that the American labor movement, unlike others who comment on the program, does not just stand aside and render ex cathedra opinions. The labor movement, already deeply involved in the war on poverty, wants to become more involved, wants greater responsibilities, seeks additional opportunities to help and to contribute. Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent that the AFL-CIO convention policy statement on the war on poverty be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR ON POVERTY

Whereas, The first three years of operation of the anti-poverty program under the direction of the Office of Economic Opportunity has opened up for thousands of the poor, opportunities for education, training, jobs, social, legal and health services that have enabled them to escape from the misery and frustration of poverty, and has given hope

and the promise of a better life to still thousands of others.

The AFL-CIO commends the action of Congress for the constructive action it has taken with regard to the anti-poverty program by continuing for two years; by authorizing \$1.98 billion for the current year and \$2.18 for the following year; by permitting anti-poverty agencies to contribute their share of the cost of local anti-poverty programs in services and facilities. We urge both Houses of Congress to appropriate the full amount authorized.

The AFL-CIO is aware of the indispensable role that local Community Action Agencies have played in the war on poverty. We feel that every effort should be made to retain a balance in the local Community Action Agency that will permit the poor and other concerned segments of the community to continue their important role in developing new and innovative programs that meet the needs of the poor.

To win the war on poverty much more needs to be done. The war on poverty should be expanded. Proven programs should be extended. New programs should be developed to meet unmet needs. While the efforts of Congress toward increased funding of the anti-poverty program are a step in the right direction, the current funding of OEO is woefully inadequate, both in terms of the need and of our capabilities. Therefore, be it

Resolved: 1. That the AFL-CIO continue to support the war on poverty at all levels, as an essential program in helping all segments of our society share in its affluence.

2. That the President and Congress are urged to expand the war on poverty under the Office of Economic Opportunity and that the funding of OEO programs be substantially increased to meet the overwhelming demand for local programs of various kinds to help the poor.

3. That local AFL-CIO central bodies cooperate with church, civil rights, school, social welfare and other community groups in safeguarding the integrity of the local Community Action Program to permit it freedom to develop, promote and carry forward meaningful anti-poverty programs.

4. That local central labor bodies insist on having adequate representation on local Community Action Agencies, along with representatives of minority groups and of the poor themselves; and where possible, state and local central bodies should initiate or sponsor programs through OEO, designed to help the poor.

EMPLOYERS IN EDUCATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently I was pleased to co-sponsor a bill, S. 2704, to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees, their families, and dependents with scholarships for study at educational institutions or for the establishment of child care centers for preschool and school age dependents of employees. It has recently come to my attention that Herbert A. Levine, director of the Labor Education Center at Rutgers, our State University in New Brunswick, N.J., has written a most penetrating article on this subject in the fall 1967 issue of *Changing Education*. In view of the importance of this issue—the maintenance of the highest standards of educational opportunity for all of our children—I ask unanimous consent that Professor Levine's article entitled "Educational Opportunity: A New Fringe Benefit for Collective Bargaining," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY: A NEW FRINGE BENEFIT FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(By Herbert A. Levine)

Both workers and management benefit when employees add to their education, says the author. That's why unions should exercise their power at the collective bargaining table to demand time and payment for class-work for their members. The writer surveys examples of current agreements, signed by several major unions, aimed at this goal, and offers suggestions for additional approaches.

American labor unions from the very outset have understood the importance of education as an instrument of democracy and a vehicle to advance the working man.¹ As a consequence, they have consistently supported social and political policies which promised to enlarge educational opportunities for working people. These unions lead the world, not only in the level of real income achieved by workers, but in the extent and nature of the fringe benefits they have won through collective bargaining.²

It is somewhat surprising, therefore, that American labor unions have not yet seriously brought educational opportunity for their members to the collective bargaining table. If unions were to turn their attention to negotiating educational opportunity in their collective bargaining agreements, it would have a profound effect not only upon the character of organized labor but on the quality and skill of the American work force. It would also significantly alter the United States' education system.

Undoubtedly, unions are correct in taking the position that education is primarily a public responsibility which should be supported, in the main, as a social charge on the public treasury.³ In this regard, many unions fought for federal aid to education, called for free universal education through college, supported the development of low-cost community colleges; and some have urged income tax deductions for education expense. But unions have negotiated a wide variety of fringe benefits, such as pensions, health plans, and supplementary unemployment benefit (SUB) plans which complement existing public programs. The time has come for unions to place educational opportunities high on their fringe benefit priority list, so that significant sums of money will become available to develop programs for supplementing public educational provisions.

THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF WORKERS

Professor Whitehead has suggested that a society which does not value trained intelligence is doomed.⁴ President Johnson says it in another way, "We must recognize that a free society today demands that we keep on learning or face the threat of national deterioration."⁵ The professionally educated union members, the engineer, the laboratory technician, the nurse, and the teacher, are being inundated by new knowledge which is increasing at a phenomenal rate. We are told

¹ "Report of the Workingmen's Committee," *Workingman's Advocate*, New York, March 6, 1820, in *Commons, A Documentary History of American Industrial Society 1909-1911*, Vol. I, pp. 95-100.

² *Directory of BLS Studies in Industrial Relations, 1954-65*, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, October, 1965.

³ *U.S. Senate 87-2, Federal Assistance to General University, Extension Education Programs (Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Washington, D.C., July 26, 1962).*

⁴ Alfred North Whitehead, *The Aims of Education* (New York City: Mentor Books, July, 1949).

⁵ Paul H. Sheats, "New Knowledge for What?" *Adult Leadership*, January, 1963, p. 194.